

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 15-18 are now pending in this application, with Claims 15 and 18 being independent. Claims 15-18 are newly presented herein. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8-12 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1, 3 and 5-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Since Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8-12 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, this rejection is deemed moot. Newly-presented Claims 15-18 have been drafted with the Examiner's comments in mind and are believed to be in full compliance with § 112. Favorable consideration is requested.

Claims 1, 3 and 5-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,526,516 (Ishikawa et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0070103 (Kim) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,114,078 (Carman). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ishikawa et al. is directed to a system to which a plurality of peripheral devices are connected. The system can control the distribution of power to the peripheral devices. Initially, it should be noted that Ishikawa et al. uses an interface according to a single specification (i.e., USB interface). This is contrary to the present invention which recites, inter alia, a first interface, conforming to a first specification, connectible to a peripheral, and a second interface, conforming to a second specification, connectible to a memory card.

In Ishikawa et al., since all connected peripherals conform to a single interface specification, power distribution over the plural connected peripherals can be

unifiedly controlled. The modern trend in devices connectible to a printer is that plural external devices conforming to different interface specifications can be concurrently connected thereto. For example, many printers can connect to both a digital camera through a USB interface and an SD memory card through a different interface. The present invention can compensate for such a trend, while Ishikawa et al. fails to disclose or suggest relevant features of the present invention recited in independent Claims 15 and 18.

In particular, Ishikawa et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least detecting a connection state and operation state of a peripheral, to which a first interface, conforming to first specification, is connectible, and controlling communication with the peripheral, detecting a connection state and operation state of a memory card, to which a second interface, conforming to a second specification, is connectible, controlling access to the memory card, determining whether or not a total amount of power supplied to both the peripheral and the memory card exceeds a predetermined amount of power, stopping supplying power to a previously-connected external device from among the peripheral and the memory card, based on a determination result, setting in a memory a flag indicating a stop of supplying power to the previously-connected external device, monitoring whether or not a external device, to which power is still being supplied, from among the peripheral and the memory card, enters an idle state, based on detection results, confirming whether or not the previously-connected external device is connected, based on detection results, and if the flag is set, restarting supplying power to the previously-connected external device, based on a monitoring result and a confirmation result, as is recited in independent Claims 15 and 18.

Thus, Ishikawa et al. fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in the independent claims.

Kim and Carman have also been reviewed, but are not believed to remedy the deficiencies of Ishikawa et al. noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Thus, independent Claims 15 and 18 are patentable over the citations of record.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 15 and 18. Dependent Claims 16 and 17 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in independent Claim 15. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark A. Williamson/

Mark A. Williamson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
MAW:ytr